

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
Oklahoma

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in Oklahoma. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, **OK**, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in Oklahoma, 2189 of a possible 2865 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .764, for a rating of 76.4%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q1, “Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.469387755	Mean	3.571428571	Mean	4.183673469	Mean	4.354166667	Mean	3.777777778
Standard Error	0.18234592	Standard Error	0.177376957	Standard Error	0.147753787	Standard Error	0.144305574	Standard Error	0.179474229
Median	4	Median	4	Median	5	Median	5	Median	4
Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5
Standard Deviation	1.276421443	Standard Deviation	1.241638702	Standard Deviation	1.034276506	Standard Deviation	0.999778344	Standard Deviation	1.203949729
Sample Variance	1.629251701	Sample Variance	1.541666667	Sample Variance	1.069727891	Sample Variance	0.999556738	Sample Variance	1.449494949
Kurtosis	-0.499758838	Kurtosis	-0.559679814	Kurtosis	1.676312023	Kurtosis	3.538246285	Kurtosis	-0.054297514
Skewness	-0.712205801	Skewness	-0.544643718	Skewness	-1.327007463	Skewness	-1.84502479	Skewness	-0.858463347
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	170	Sum	175	Sum	205	Sum	209	Sum	170
Count	49	Count	49	Count	49	Count	48	Count	45
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	4.212765957	Mean	3.868421053	Mean	3.98	Mean	7.56	Mean	7.041666667
Standard Error	0.145662448	Standard Error	0.169389552	Standard Error	0.152502927	Standard Error	0.319642658	Standard Error	0.352244995
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	8
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	8
Standard Deviation	0.998611432	Standard Deviation	1.044187325	Standard Deviation	1.078358541	Standard Deviation	2.260214908	Standard Deviation	2.440424914
Sample Variance	0.997224792	Sample Variance	1.090327169	Sample Variance	1.162857143	Sample Variance	5.108571429	Sample Variance	5.955673759
Kurtosis	2.69923209	Kurtosis	1.527328248	Kurtosis	0.761049093	Kurtosis	0.390388779	Kurtosis	-0.50341751
Skewness	-1.544321266	Skewness	-1.227557892	Skewness	-1.077876808	Skewness	-0.959812796	Skewness	-0.526986574
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	198	Sum	147	Sum	199	Sum	378	Sum	338
Count	47	Count	38	Count	50	Count	50	Count	48

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

